

Environmental Initial Study

Colfax 2004 Colfax Housing Element Update of the General Plan

Colfax, California

February 4, 2004

Prepared by Raney Planning and Management

INITIAL STUDY

I. BACKGROUND

1. Project Title: City of Colfax General Plan, Housing Element Update
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Colfax
33 South Main Street
Colfax, CA 95713
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Bob Perrault, City Manager
City of Colfax
530.346-2313
1. Project Location: The City of Colfax
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Bob Perrault, City Manager
City of Colfax
33 South Main Street
Colfax, CA 95713
6. General Plan Designation: N/A
7. Zoning: N/A
8. Project Description Summary:

The project involves the update of the Housing Element of the City of Colfax General Plan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Background.....	1
II.	Sources.....	2
III.	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected.....	2
IV.	Determination	2
I.	Background and Introduction	3
II.	Project Description.....	4
III.	Environmental Checklist.....	7
I.	Aesthetics.....	7
II.	Agriculture Resources.....	9
III.	Air Quality	10
IV.	Biological Resources	15
V.	Cultural Resources	17
VI.	Geology and Soils.....	18
VII.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	22
VIII.	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	25
IX.	Land Use and Planning	30
X.	Mineral Resources	31
XI.	Noise	32
XII.	Population and Housing	35
XIII.	Public Services.....	36
XIV.	Recreation	38
XV.	Transportation/Circulation.....	39
XVI.	Utilities and Service Systems.....	41
XVII.	Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	43

II. SOURCES

The following documents are referenced information sources utilized by this analysis:

1. City of Colfax General Plan, 1992-2012;
2. City of Colfax General Plan Initial Study and Mitigation Program August, 1998
3. City of Colfax Housing Element of the General Plan, Public Review Draft, November 2003.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation & Circulation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

- ☒ I find that the Proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier General Plan EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier General Plan EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Bob Perrault, City Manager

Printed Name

City of Colfax

For

V. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study provides an environmental analysis pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, for the proposed City of Colfax General Plan Housing Element Update (proposed project).

The project site is the City of Colfax Planning Area. The City of Colfax is one of six incorporated cities in Placer County. The City is located in the central County area along Interstate 80, a primary transportation route connecting Colfax to Sacramento on the south and Reno on the north. Colfax is about 20 miles east of the Roseville City urban area and approximately 50 miles east of Sacramento. Currently, the incorporated City and sphere of influence covers approximately 2,294 acres.

As required by State law (Section 65580 – 65589.8 of the California Government Code), the proposed project includes an update of the City of Colfax's General Plan Housing Element. The update identifies residential sites adequate to accommodate a variety of housing types for all income levels and needs of special population groups defined under State law (Section 65583 of the California Government Code), analyzes governmental constraints to housing maintenance, improvement and development, addresses conservation and improvement of the condition of the existing affordable housing stock, and outlines policies to promote housing opportunities for all persons.

In preparing this Initial Study, the City has relied on the Colfax General Plan and the Initial Study and Mitigation Program prepared with the General Plan. Pursuant to Section 21083.3 of the Public Resources Code, the City incorporates by reference these documents, which are available for examination at the City Hall, 33 South Main Street, Colfax, CA 95713.

This Initial Study focuses on whether the proposed project may cause significant effects on the environment that were not examined in the General Plan Initial Study. In particular, consistent with Section 21083.3, this Initial Study and Mitigation Program is intended to assess any effects on the environment that are peculiar to the proposed project or to the parcels on which the project would be located and were not addressed or analyzed as significant effects in the General

Plan Initial Study and Mitigation Program, or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the previous Initial Study.

Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Mitigation Program that apply to the proposed project will be required as part of the project. These mitigation measures may be further clarified to address impacts specific to this project. Implementation of project-specific mitigation measures for new, potentially significant impacts that were not previously identified in the General Plan Initial Study will also be required as part of the proposed project.

VI. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Housing Element is an integral component of the City's General Plan. The Housing Element addresses existing and future housing needs of all types for persons of all economic groups in the City. The Housing Element is a tool for use by citizens and public officials in understanding and meeting the housing needs in Colfax.

The State Legislature has mandated that a Housing Element be included in every General Plan since 1969. The Housing Element is one of the seven required elements in a General Plan. Article 10.6, Section 65589 – 65589.8, Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code sets forth the legal requirements for a Housing Element and encourages the provision of affordable and decent housing in all communities to meet Statewide goals. Specifically, Section 65580 states the Housing Element shall consist of "[...] an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing." The Housing Element must also contain a five-year housing plan with quantified objectives for the implementation of the goals and objectives described in the Housing Element. State law requires the Housing Element be updated every five years.

The City of Colfax's current Housing Element was adopted in 1993. At the time of the adoption, all Elements of the City's General Plan were consistent. This Initial Study evaluates the environmental effects of the new 2003-2008 Colfax Housing Element. It should be noted that although the title of the new Housing Element specifies the dates "2003-2008," the Housing Element actually covers the needs for the period 2001 through 2008.

Government Code Section 65583 requires that the Housing Element include the following components:

- A review of the previous element's goals, policies, programs, and objectives to ascertain the effectiveness of each of these components, as well as the overall effectiveness of the Housing Element.
- An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints related to the meeting of these needs.
- An analysis and program for preserving assisted housing developments.
- A statement of community goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, preservation, improvement and development of housing.
- A program which sets forth a five-year schedule of actions that the City is undertaking or intends to undertake, in implementing the policies set forth in the Housing Element.

Between 1990 and 2000, the City of Colfax grew from 1,306 people to 1,596 people or an annual rate of approximately 2.2 percent. Several factors influence the degree of demand for housing in the City of Colfax. Four major "needs" categories considered in the Housing Element include: housing needs resulting from overcrowding; housing needs that result when households are paying more than they can afford for housing; housing needs of "special needs groups" such as the elderly, large families, female heads of households, households with persons with disabilities, and the homeless; and housing needs resulting from population growth in the City and surrounding region.

California's Housing Element law requires that each city and county develop local housing programs designed to meet its "fair share" of housing needs for all income groups. This "fair share" allocation seeks to ensure that each jurisdiction accepts responsibility for the housing needs of not only its current residents, but also for those households who might be reasonably expected to reside within the jurisdiction. A jurisdiction's "fair share" of regional housing need is the number of additional dwelling units that would be required to accommodate the anticipated growth in households, replace expected demolitions and conversion of housing units to non-housing uses, and achieve a future vacancy rate that allows for the healthy functioning of the housing market.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) develops the Regional Housing Needs Assessments (RHNA) for the cities in Sacramento County, Placer County, and El Dorado County. The purpose of the RHNA is to allocate to the region their "fair share" of the region's projected housing need by household income group for the 7 year Housing Element planning period (currently 2001-2008). SACOG completed the most recent plan for the County from 2001 to 2008 on May 17, 2001. The RHNA anticipates a 21.2 percent (%) increased need for housing in the City of Colfax. This results in a total allocation of 135 homes to the City of Colfax. The housing need is further divided by four income categories of Very Low (up to 50 percent of Placer County median income), Low (up to 80 percent), Moderate (up to 120 percent), and Above Moderate (more than 120 percent) income categories. Table 1 breaks down the allocation by these income categories.

Between 2001 and September 2003, a total of 123 units were constructed in the City of Colfax. As the current RHNA cycle includes 2001-2002, in the respective appropriate income category, these dwelling units have been applied toward the 135 dwelling unit housing need identified for the City of Colfax, leaving a balance of **45 dwelling units as the current construction need** (see table 1). Because the environmental review of the 135 dwelling units constructed between 2001-2002 was previously conducted on a project-by-project basis, this document will only be assessing the potential impacts related to the provision of adequate land to accommodate the balance of the 135 units RHNA assigned to the City of Colfax or 45 units.

Table 1 City of Colfax Housing Allocation, 2001-2008			
<u>Income Group/Percent of Households</u>	Allocation	2001- Sept 2003 Construction	Current Construction Need
Very Low – 5.2%	7	0	7
Low – 12.6%	17	50	0
Moderate – 22.2%	30	28	2
Above Moderate – 60.0%	81	45	36
TOTAL	135	123	45
Source: 2000 Regional Housing Allocation Plan, SACOG			

As part of the 2003-2008 Housing Element update, an analysis of the residential development potential of vacant land in the City of Colfax was completed in September 2003. A total of 156.6 acres of vacant land are currently zoned residential in the City of Colfax that will accommodate up to 591 new housing units, 546 more than needed to meet the RHNA goals. Table 2 is a listing of vacant land by general plan classification along with the conservative unit capacity for this classification.

TABLE 2 Vacant Residential Acreage and Units				
Zoning	Low Density	Medium Density	Medium High Density	Total
Acres	113.4	15.6	27.6	246.7
Units	151	109	331	591
Source: September 2003 Vacant Land Survey				

Discretionary Action

Implementation of the proposed project would require the following discretionary actions by the City of Colfax Planning Commission/City Council:

- Approval of a Negative Declaration; and
- Approval of the Housing Element for the City of Colfax.

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following Checklist contains the environmental checklist form presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The checklist form is used to describe the impacts of the proposed project. A discussion follows each environmental issue identified in the checklist. Included in each discussion are project-specific mitigation measures deemed appropriate and recommended as part of the proposed project.

For this checklist, the following designations are used:

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that could be significant, and for which no mitigation has been identified. If any potentially significant impacts are identified, an EIR must be prepared.

Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: An impact that requires mitigation to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Less-Than-Significant Impact: Any impact that would not be considered significant under CEQA relative to existing standards.

No Impact: The project would not have any impact.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-c. The City of Colfax consists of mountains, rolling hills, valleys, and forest. Architectural and historic components provide significant scenic vistas within certain developed portions of the City. The combination of natural and developed influences has combined to produce numerous scenic vistas throughout the City.

The Housing Element Update anticipates the need for 45 housing units in the City for the 7 year period from 2001 to 2008. Without identifying the location of residential development, the potential impact of development on a scenic vista, scenic resources, historic buildings, or visual character of the City is impossible to determine. Furthermore, because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific visual impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case design review of future housing projects would be carried out to ensure that existing views and aesthetic conditions are preserved, and that the projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- d. Development of residential uses in accordance with applicable provisions of the City's Housing Element Update would create new sources of light and glare in the City. The increased density and intensity of residential uses would increase the amount of light and glare in developed areas (from exterior lighting, street lighting, vehicular lighting, and interior lighting visible from the outside). To minimize potential light and glare impacts, future development proposed by the Housing Element Update would be required to comply with applicable policies governing light and glare outlined in the Community Design Element in the General Plan, City of Colfax development standards, and/or requirements mandated during the environmental review of individual residential developments. Adherence to these standards and/or requirements would reduce potential light and glare impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--------------

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1977) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| a. | Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- a.c. Soils within the Colfax Planning Area are primarily made up of Class VI and Class VII soils. Prime Farmland soils, according to the Williamson Act definition, are made up of Class I or Class II soils. (Natural Environment Element, 6.5).

The proposed project identifies a housing need of 45 housing units in the City, which would not require the conversion of farmland. Currently there are no agricultural lands within the City Limits. Because this is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific agricultural impacts that may result with future housing development proposals; a case-by-case environmental review of future housing projects would be necessary which would ensure impacts related to the loss of farmland would be minimized. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less-than-significant* impacts to agricultural resources.

- b. Individual development projects necessary to satisfy the housing need identified in the Housing Element update would be reviewed to ascertain potential impacts with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use, or Williamson Act designation. Adherence to applicable City standards related to agricultural zoning, use or Williamson Act lands would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY.				
<i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a. c. The City of Colfax is part of the Mountain Counties Air Basin, which shares the "airshed" with the eastern two-thirds of Placer County. Colfax is within the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). The Sacramento Valley Air Basin, which is west of Placer County, has a serious air quality problem. Colfax, although east of Sacramento Valley Air Basin, may suffer some transfer of pollutants, and is subject to some of the same air quality concerns, due to its location within the mountain valley. Of the emissions generated within Placer County, 85 percent are transferred from the Sacramento Valley, 12 percent from the mountain counties, and 3 percent from Lake Tahoe (Colfax General Plan 6-5). The Mountain Counties Air Basin has air pollution problems that are influenced by specific meteorological and topographical factors. The prevailing wind direction generally funnels through the mountain valleys. These winds trap pollutants in the basin.

Placer County is classified as a State and Federal nonattainment area for ozone, a state nonattainment area for PM_{10} and is unclassified in the State and Federal standards for carbon monoxide. The APCD's non-attainment area plan is known as the *1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan*. Implementation of the *Attainment Plan* is not expected to achieve the required five percent reduction of pollutant levels due in large part to the fact that 85 percent of the pollutants that ultimately reside within Placer County are actually generated in the urbanized areas to the west and transferred east via wind patterns. Currently, the City of Colfax follows the Placer County Offset Mitigation Measures, and Placer County Best Available Mitigation Measures, 1996, to reduce impact on local air quality.

New development within the City shall comply with the density and intensity standards outlined in the Land Use Element and the City's current Zoning Ordinance. The City must be diligent in its efforts to ensure that each future project is carefully reviewed to ensure consistency with Federal, State, and local air quality standards and consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect air quality. Therefore, a case-by-case review of future housing projects to ensure that air quality is protected and that they are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies would be necessary. Adherence to such standards and guidelines would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- b. Since 1970, air quality has been regulated at the federal level under the Clean Air Act (CAA). This act authorized the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for air pollutants of nationwide concern. The EPA has established standards for six criteria air pollutants. These pollutants include ozone (O_3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), suspended particulate matter (PM_{10}), and lead (Pb). $PM_{2.5}$ particulate matter has recently been added to this listing; however, data to document ambient conditions or quantify these emissions do not yet exist. Primary standards for air pollutants were established to protect public health, while secondary standards were established to protect the public welfare by preventing impairment of visibility and damage to vegetation and property.

In addition, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has set state standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, and visibility reducing particles. These standards are designed to protect the health and welfare of the populace with a reasonable margin of safety. These criteria refer to episode levels representing periods of short-term exposure to air pollutants that actually threaten public health. Federal and State standards are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3
Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State	Federal	
			Primary	Secondary
Ozone (O ₃)	1 hour	0.09 ppm (180 ig/m ³)	0.12 ppm (235 ig/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard
	8 hour	0.08 ppm	0.08 ppm	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	Annual Average	0.053 ppm (100 ig/m ³)	0.053 ppm (100 ig/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard
	1 hour	0.25 ppm (470 ig/m ³)	--	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	8 hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	--
	1 hour	20.0 ppm (23 mg/m ³)	35.0 ppm (40 mg/m ³)	
Suspended Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	Annual Geometric Mean	30 ig/m ³	--	--
	24 Hour	50 ig/m ³	150 ig/m ³	Same as Primary Standard
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	--	50 ig/m ³	
Suspended Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	Annual Arithmetic Mean	--	15 ig/m ³	--
	24 Hour	--	65 ig/m ³	--
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	Annual Average	--	0.03 ppm (80 ig/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 ig/m ³)	0.14 ppm (365 ig/m ³)	
	3 Hour	--	--	0.5 ppm (1,300 ig/m ³)
	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 ig/m ³)	--	--
Lead (Pb)	30 Day Average	1.5 ig/m ³	--	--
	Calendar Quarter	--	(1.5 ig/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 ig/m ³	--	--
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 ig/m ³)	--	--
Vinyl Chloride (Chloroethene)	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 ig/m ³)	--	--
Visibility Reducing Particles	8 Hour (10 a.m. to 6 p.m. PST)	**	--	--

Note: ** In sufficient amount to produce an extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer due to particles when the relative humidity is less than 70 percent. Measurement in accordance with ARB Method V.
Source: ARB Fact Sheet 39, 1998.

The Federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977 required that each state adopt an implementation plan outlining pollution control measures to attain the federal standards in non-attainment or maintenance areas of the state.

The CARB oversees activities of local air quality management agencies, and is responsible for incorporating air quality management plans for local air basins into a State Implementation Plan (SIP) for federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approval. The SIP is a plan that provides for implementation, maintenance, and

enforcement of the Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). CARB maintains air quality monitoring stations throughout the State in conjunction with local air districts. Data collected at these stations are used by the CARB to classify air basins as "attainment" or "non-attainment" with respect to each pollutant and to areas that meet the AAQS, while non-attainment refers to areas that do not meet the AAQS. Maintenance areas refer to geographic areas that were once non-attainment but have shown recently that the areas are achieving the AAQS.

The federal CAA prohibits federal departments and agencies or other agencies from acting on behalf of the federal government, and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) from engaging in, supporting in any way, providing financial assistance for, licensing, permitting or approving any activity that does not conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

Ozone

Ozone (smog) is formed by photochemical reactions between oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases rather than being directly emitted. Ozone is a pungent, colorless gas typical of smog. Elevated ozone concentrations result in reduced lung function, particularly during vigorous physical activity. This health problem is particularly acute in sensitive receptors such as the sick, elderly, and young children. Ozone levels peak during the summer and early fall months. The APCD is designated as a non-attainment area for both federal and State ozone standards, meaning that air quality standards are being exceeded.

Carbon Monoxide

Carbon monoxide (CO) is formed by the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels, almost entirely from automobiles. CO is a colorless, odorless gas that can cause dizziness, fatigue, and impairments to central nervous system functions. The APCD is designated as an unclassified area for State and federal CO standards.

Nitrogen Oxides

Nitrogen dioxide, a reddish brown gas, and nitric oxide (NO), a colorless, odorless gas, are formed from fuel combustion under high temperature or pressure. These compounds are referred to jointly as nitrogen oxides, or NO_x . NO_x is a primary component of the photochemical smog reaction. They also contribute to other pollution problems, including a high concentration of fine particulate matter, poor visibility, and acid deposition. Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) decreases lung function and may reduce resistance to infection. The APCD is designated as attainment areas for State NO_2 standards and unclassified for Federal Standards.

Sulfur Dioxide

Sulfur dioxide (SO_2) is a colorless irritating gas formed primarily from incomplete combustion of fuels containing sulfur. Industrial facilities also contribute to gaseous SO_2 levels. SO_2 irritates the respiratory tract, can injure lung tissue when combined with fine particulate matter, and reduces visibility and the level of sunlight. APCD region is in

attainment with both federal and State sulfur dioxide standards.

Particulate Matter

Particulate matter is the term used for a mixture of solid particles and liquid droplets found in the air. Coarse particles (larger than 2.5 but smaller than 10 micrometers, or PM_{10}) come from a variety of sources, including windblown dust and grinding operations. Fine particles (less than 2.5 micrometers, or $PM_{2.5}$) often come from fuel combustion, power plants, and diesel buses and trucks. Fine particles can also be formed in the atmosphere through chemical reactions. Coarse particles (PM_{10}) can accumulate in the respiratory system and aggravate health problems such as asthma. EPA's scientific review concluded that fine particles ($PM_{2.5}$), which penetrate deeply into the lungs, are more likely than coarse particles to contribute to the health effects listed in a number of recently published community epidemiological studies at concentrations that extend well below those allowed by the current PM_{10} standards. These health effects include premature death and increased hospital admissions and emergency room visits (primarily the elderly and individuals with cardiopulmonary disease); increased respiratory symptoms and disease (children and individuals with cardiopulmonary disease such as asthma); decreased lung functions (particularly in children and individuals with asthma); and alterations in lung tissue and structure and in respiratory tract defense mechanisms.

The APCD has designated non-attainment areas for the State PM_{10} standards and attainment for federal standards. The attainment status of $PM_{2.5}$ in these basins has not been established by the EPA or the CARB.

The City must be diligent in its efforts to ensure that each future project is carefully reviewed to ensure consistency with Federal, State, and local air quality standards and consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect air quality. Therefore, a case-by-case review of future housing projects to ensure that air quality is protected and that they are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies would be necessary. Adherence to such standards and guidelines would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- d.e. The Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. New development within the City must comply with the density and intensity standards outlined in the Land Use Element and the City's current Zoning Ordinance. A case-by-case review of future housing projects to ensure that air quality is protected and that the projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies would be necessary. Furthermore, the construction of residences, in addition to the activities associated with the residences would not result in the creation of objectionable odors. Adherence to all applicable standards and guidelines would reduce potential impacts related to sensitive receptors to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--------------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.*Would the project:*

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| a. | Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✗ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✗ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✗ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. | Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✗ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. | Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✗ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. | Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✗ | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- a-f. The City of Colfax habitat types include chaparral and shrub communities, woodland communities, conifer forest communities, and sierran mixed conifer forest. Under the tree canopy are scrub-oak, manzanita, deer brush, and a variety of herbs and grasses. The natural vegetation supports various wildlife including California Quail, Gray Fox, mule deer, California thrasher, western rattlesnake, brush rabbit, dusk-footed wood rat, Western gray squirrel, California ground squirrel, bobcat, raccoon, scrub jay, golden mantled ground squirrel, and mountain lion. State or Federally Listed rare or endangered animal species are not known to exist in the City, or the City's sphere of Influence. (See Natural Environment Element, 6.2-6.3)

The Housing Element Update anticipates the need for 45 housing units in the City for the 7-year period from January 2001 to July 2008. The Colfax General Plan and accompanying Land Use Diagram have been developed with extensive resource protection policies and reserve areas. Amending the City of Colfax General Plan to include the Housing Element Update would not result in any significant impacts on biological resources because implementation of the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with State and Federal laws and the goals, policies, and standards established within the Natural Environment Element of the General Plan, which are intended to protect biological resources.

Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific biological impacts that may result from future housing development proposals. Therefore, future case-by-case reviews of future housing projects would be necessary to assess the potential for housing project specific biological impacts and project consistency with State and Federal regulations and all General Plan goals, objectives and policies. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource on site or unique geologic features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-d. Cultural resources are places, structures, or objects that are important for scientific, historic, and/or religious reasons to cultures, communities, groups, or individuals. Cultural resources include historic and prehistoric archaeological sites, architectural remains, engineering structures, and artifacts that provide evidence of past human activity. They also include places, resources, or items of importance in the traditions of societies and religions.

Two major peoples lived in the Colfax area during the prehistoric period, the Maidu and the Mewok Native Americans. While it is unknown whether there was a permanent settlement located in what is present day Colfax, all new construction is monitored by an archeological expert in case prehistorical artifacts are uncovered.

The history of Colfax began in a little valley just below Colfax on the southern side of the Southern Pacific Railroad. Along a bend in the valley known as Alder Grove, miners first congregated as early as the spring of 1849. The area became the distributing point of supplies for all of the mining camps around it. As a commercial area, it ranked with Dry Diggings (Auburn) until late in the fall of 1849, when fear of a harsh winter in the upper canyon area discouraged winter trading activity. The site for the town which is today known as Colfax was laid out by the Central Pacific Railroad in 1865.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines historic resources as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, manuscript or other resource listed or determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission, a local register of historic resources, or the lead agency. Generally a resources is considered to be "historically significant" if it meets one of the following criteria:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the lives of important persons in the past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The Housing Element Update requires the development of an additional 45 housing units in the City. However, the Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than ordinance amendments or specific projects. Without specific data on the location and type of new residential development, it is not possible to determine potential impacts to archaeological and historic resources. Review of new residential development(s) would permit an analysis of how such development may potentially conflict with known archeological and/or historic resources. The possibility also exists that future development would discover or uncover previously unknown archeological resources. Therefore, a case-by-case review of future housing projects and programs to ensure consistency with State, Federal, and all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies would be necessary. Adherence to applicable City, County, State, and federal standards and guidelines related to the protection/preservation of cultural resources, as well as the requirements mandated during the environmental review of individual projects would reduce potential impacts related to cultural resources to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist - Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1B of the Uniform Building Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-i.ii. As of the most recent listing of cities and counties affected by the Alquist-Priolo Act does not include either the City of Colfax or Placer County. Rupture of the surface has not resulted from faulting associated with earthquakes in Placer County. The nearest fault line is the Stampede Valley fault that was last active in 1966 during the Truckee earthquake. This fault line does not extend into Colfax but may extend into parts of Placer County.

Amending the City of Colfax General Plan to include the Housing Element Update would not result in any significant geological impacts because actions to implement the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect the safety of the community. Furthermore, all new housing development and rehabilitation that might result from Housing Element implementation would be required to be consistent with existing State and Local building codes which are designed to ensure that new construction does not expose people to significant geological impacts. Therefore, seismic hazards would have *less-than-significant* impacts to the proposed project.

- a-iii,iv,c. Liquefaction is a process by which water-saturated materials (including soil, sediment, and certain types of volcanic deposits) lose strength and may fail during strong ground shaking. Liquefaction is defined as "the transformation of a granular material from a solid state into a liquefied state as a consequence of increased pore-water pressure. The Colfax General Plan Safety Element identifies the bed of streams or sloped exposures as areas of the City of Colfax that are the most susceptible to liquefaction. (Colfax General Plan p. 7-3).

Landslide can occur with or without an earthquake. These slope failures can be attributed to the type of material, structural properties of that material, steepness of slope, water, vegetation type, and proximity to areas of active erosion. Within Colfax, landslides are attributed to both erosion and the steepness of slope. The City of Colfax's Hillside development guidelines are in place to mitigate for landslides due to development.

The update to the City's Housing Element identifies that an additional 45 housing units are required in the City. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of these additional residential units, it is not possible to determine if new residential development is subject to liquefaction, landslide, and other related hazards. New residential development within the City would be designed and constructed to meet the most current seismic safety standards for liquefaction included in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and/or standards established by the City of Colfax. Adherence to these requirements would reduce potential liquefaction, landslide, and other related impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

- b. The Placer County General Plan Background Report identifies Colfax and the surrounding area as having soils that present a moderate to high erosion hazard. Due to this risk, parcels that have gradients of more than 10 percent are subject to the City's Hillside guidelines. Development in these areas are encouraged to use innovated design concepts such as clustering, split pads, and underground or below grade rooms to provide energy efficient and environmentally desirable spaces. Cluster development is when structures are built grouped close together to preserve open spaces larger than the individual yard for common recreation for the purpose of protecting and preserving natural landforms, and/or environmentally sensitive areas by maintaining open space. In these design areas the maximum number of residential dwelling units shall be as determined by environmental assessment, unless such development constraints can be shown to have been eliminated or mitigated to the satisfaction of the Planning

Commission or of the City Council. Development of the 45 residential units identified in the Housing Needs Assessment would require earth-moving activities, which would expose soils, thereby increasing the potential for erosion or loss of topsoil. The susceptibility of soils to erosion varies depending on the location, base material, topography, surrounding environment (e.g., natural cover or paved surfaces), and the level of ground disturbance activities. In the absence of information as to where new residential development would occur, it is not possible to ascertain if (or to what level), the development of specific residential projects would contribute to the erosion of or loss of topsoil.

Compliance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) requirements as well as common construction and grading practices would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion to a *less-than-significant* level.

- d. Expansive soils have the potential for shrinking and swelling with changes in moisture content, which can cause damage to overlying structures. The amount and type of clay in the soil influences the changes. According to the Colfax General Plan Initial Study, much of the Colfax Planning Area contains soils that have low to moderate expansive soils.

The update to the City's Housing Element identifies that an additional 45 housing units are required in the City. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of these additional residential units, it is not possible to determine if new residential development is subject to hazards associated with expansive soil(s). New residential development within the City would be designed and constructed to meet the most current standards included in the Uniform Building Code and/or standards established by the City such as the Hillside Development Standards. Implementation of the related City of Colfax General Plan Policies would mitigate any potential impacts to a less-than-significant level (Colfax General Plan Initial Study, p. 7). Therefore, adherence to the above requirements would reduce potential expansive soils impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

- a. The Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. In addition, future residential development within the City would generally utilize local sewer systems. In areas where the use of septic systems is required, such systems would be designed, constructed, and maintained in accordance with established City standards. The suitability of specific sites to accommodate septic systems shall be determined prior to development via the preparation of applicable required studies. Adherence to applicable City standards related to the placement, construction, and suitability of septic systems would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a.b. The potential release of hazardous materials along roadways is an on-going condition that is regulated by federal, State, and local regulations. This condition would exist with or without the proposed project.

The update to the City's Housing Element identifies that an additional 45 housing units are required in the City. Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific hazardous impacts that may result from future housing development proposals.

Amending the City of Colfax General Plan to include the Housing Element Update would not result in any significant hazards, such as exposure to potential health hazards, or creation of a health hazards, because actions to implement the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect the safety of the community. However, to ensure that development of housing on specific sites does not result in potentially significant hazards or expose people to potential health hazards, future projects would be reviewed for consistency with state, federal, and local requirements and guidelines. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- c. Residential units constructed through implementation of the Housing Element Update may be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or planned school. The Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of these additional residential units, it is not possible to determine potential impacts to existing or planned schools. An analysis of potential impacts associated with the Housing Element Update to existing or planned schools would be conducted during the environmental review of specific residential developments. Adherence to applicable City, State, and/or federal regulations related to the transport, use, storage or disposal of hazardous materials would reduce the potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.
- d. The Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of additional residential units, a residential development site cannot be identified as being located in or near an area identified as a hazardous materials site. Review of potential impacts related to this issue would be conducted during the environmental review of specific residential developments. Adherence to applicable City, State, and/or federal regulations would reduce potential hazards to the public to a *less-than-significant* level.
- e,f. Airports are not located within the City of Colfax or within the Planning Area. The nearest Public or Private Use Airport is the Nevada County Airport, 7.2 miles from the City of Colfax. State Law charges Nevada County with administering an Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP).

The Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. Future development proposals would undergo analysis to determine whether a residential development site would be located within an ALUP or if such development would create a safety hazard for persons residing in new residential developments. Review of potential impacts related to this issue would be conducted during the environmental review of specific residential developments. Adherence to applicable City, State, and/or federal regulations would reduce potential hazards associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- g. The Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of additional residential units, the impact of new residential development on the emergency response and/or emergency evacuation plans adopted by the City cannot be determined. Development of residential uses would be consistent with applicable requirements of adopted emergency response/evacuation plans; thus, reducing potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.
- h. The Housing Element Update is a policy level document and therefore does not contain specific projects. However, upon the construction of housing anticipated in the Housing Element Update, new housing would typically occur on undeveloped or underutilized land, some of which may be located adjacent to areas with a significant risk for property damage or injury resulting from wildland fires. The transition from natural vegetation to urban uses would increase the potential for wildland fire impacts. New residential development would be evaluated to determine the exposure of people and structures to a significant risk of loss due to wildland fires. New development would adhere to applicable and appropriate standards and regulations of responsible fire authorities; thereby, reducing potential wildland fire impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year floodplain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a.f. Under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues NPDES permits to regulate waste dischargers to "waters of the nation." Waters of the nation include rivers, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and construction project discharges. A construction project resulting in the disturbance of one (1) or more acres requires a NPDES permit. Construction project proponents are required to prepare a SWPPP.

The Housing Element Update is a policy level document and therefore does not contain specific projects. Future development anticipated in the Housing Element Update would be subject to the City's environmental review process; therefore, future residential development would be evaluated on an individual basis for potential violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements as it is proposed. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) as specified by the NPDES permit and the approval of a SWPPP would ensure that any potential impacts associated with this issue would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

- b. The Housing Element Update is a policy level document and therefore does not contain specific projects. In addition, Colfax is not heavily reliant on groundwater. The Placer County Water Agency supplies water to much of Colfax. PCWA water supply comes from the Yuba-Bear and American River watersheds and snow pack runoff. Therefore, the impacts associated with the Housing Element would be *less-than-significant* and mitigation measures are not required.

- c-e. Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific stormwater runoff and drainage pattern impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case design review of future housing projects would be carried out to ensure the safety of the future communities, and that future projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- g-i. According to FEMA, Colfax does not exist in a 100-year flood plan. For the purposes of Flood Hazard mapping it is zoned category "C". Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific flooding impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case design review of future housing projects would be carried out to ensure the safety of the future communities, and that future projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- j. Tsunamis are defined as sea waves created by undersea fault movement. A tsunami poses little danger away from shorelines. Colfax is several miles inland from any sea or ocean and, therefore, would not suffer from a tsunami.

A seiche is a long wavelength, large-scale wave action set up in a closed body of water such as a lake or reservoir, whose destructive capacity is not as great as that of tsunamis. Colfax is not located near a lake that is identified as having a potential threat from a seiche. However, mudflows typically occur in mountainous or hilly terrain. The City of Colfax is mountainous and hilly and has experienced mudflows in the past.

Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific impacts resulting from seiches and mudslides that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case design review of future housing projects would be carried out to ensure the safety of the future communities, and that future projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating on environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x

Discussion

- a. Development anticipated by the Housing Element Update would involve development of vacant land and underutilized land. The proposed project would involve a change in land use from vacant land to residential urban uses, but would not significantly divide any community or reduce access to community amenities. Therefore, project impacts are considered *less-than-significant* and mitigation measures are not required.
- b. The City of Colfax's current Housing Element was adopted in 1993. At the time of the adoption, all Elements of the City's General Plan were consistent. In accordance with State Law, the City of Colfax has prepared a new 2003-2008 Housing Element, which is the document evaluated in this Initial Study. With the adoption of this new Housing Element, all elements of Colfax's General Plan will be consistent with one another. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less-than-significant* impacts to land use plans and policies.
- c. Currently, habitat conservation plans or natural communities conservation plans do not exist within the Colfax Planning Area. Therefore, development anticipated by the Housing Element would have *no impacts* to habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a.b. Currently there is an inactive mine located within the City of Colfax that may still contain trace veins of the mineral gold. The proposed project identifies a housing need of 45 housing units in the City. The possibility exists that the development of some of the houses would result in the loss of availability of mineral resources. However, because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific impacts related to mineral resources that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case design review of future housing projects would be carried out to ensure that future projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE.				
<i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a. Sound refers to anything that is or may be perceived by the ear. Noise is usually defined as unwanted sound. Noise consists of any sound that may produce physiological or psychological damage and/or interfere with communication, work, rest, recreation, and sleep. Noise impacts can be described in three categories. The first is audible impacts that refer to increases in noise levels noticeable to humans. Audible increases in noise levels generally refer to a change of 3.0 decibels (dB) or greater because this level has been found to be barely perceptible in exterior environments. The second category, potentially audible, refers to a change in the noise level between 1.0 and 3.0 dB. This range of noise levels has been found to be noticeable only in laboratory environments. The last category is changes in noise level of less than 1.0 dB that are inaudible to the human ear. Only

audible changes in existing ambient or background noise levels are considered potentially significant.

The proposed project identifies a housing need of 45 housing units in the City. Typically, residential housing does not generate unacceptable noise levels, which would exceed City standards. However, adoption and implementation of the Housing Element may be expected to result in the exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or Noise Ordinance. Without identifying the location of residential development, it is not possible to determine if future housing would be placed near land uses that would generate noise levels that would exceed acceptable standards. Therefore, a case-by-case review of future housing projects would be carried out to ensure that future residents are not exposed to unacceptable noise levels, and that the projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies, and the City's Noise Ordinance. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- b. The construction of new residential uses would require the use of earthmoving vehicles and construction equipment. The operation of this equipment would temporarily increase the potential for groundborne vibration and/or noise. Potential ground borne noise/vibration impacts resulting construction of additional residential units envisioned by the Housing Element Update would be short-term. This issue would be evaluated as part of the environmental review of future residential development. Construction activities associated with new residential development would required to comply with applicable City standards regarding the generation of ground vibration or groundborne noise. Adherence to these measures would reduce impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.
- c. The update to the Housing Element identifies that an additional 45 housing units are required in the City. The development of new residential uses typically increases the traffic volumes in the vicinity of new development. Because traffic noise is a primary contributor to the local noise environment, any increase in traffic resulting from the development of new residential uses would be expected to proportionally increase local noise levels.

An analysis of potential impacts associated with permanent increases in ambient noise levels brought about through implementation of the Housing Element Update would be conducted as part of the environmental review of individual residential developments. Adherence to applicable City and/or State noise standards would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- d. The update to the Housing Element identifies that an additional 45 housing units are required in the City. Development of new residential uses would require the modification of individual project sites, installation of utilities, and construction of structures. Noise generated from grading and construction equipment as well as noise generated from workers' vehicles would contribute to a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site.

An analysis of potential impacts associated with temporary increases in ambient noise levels brought about through implementation of the Housing Element Update would be conducted as part of the environmental review of individual residential developments. Adherence to applicable City and/or State noise standards would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

- e,f. Airports are not located within the City of Colfax or within the Planning Area. The nearest Public or Private Use Airport is the Nevada County Airport, 7.2 miles from the City of Colfax. Therefore aircraft operations at the airport are not audible in the Planning Area and existing and future operations are not identified as a potential noise source within the Planning Area.

The update to the Housing Element identifies that an additional 45 housing units are required in the City. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of additional residential units, potential airport-related noise impacts cannot be determined. Future residential development anticipated by the Housing Element Update would be evaluated to identify how such development would be potentially impacted by airport related noise. Compliance with applicable City, State, and/or federal noise standards would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a-c. The addition of the housing units proposed in the Housing Element Update would help to increase the number of housing units in the City and improve the jobs/housing balance. All of the housing development proposed by the Housing Element Update is within the existing City limits on land that is already served by the necessary infrastructure for residential development or land that can have the necessary infrastructure systems extended. For these reasons, adoption and implementation of the Housing Element would not be expected to induce substantial growth that would require significant new infrastructure, displace substantial numbers of existing housing, or necessitate the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, approval and implementation of the Housing Element Update would have *less-than-significant* impacts to population and housing.

The Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. Future development anticipated by the Housing Element Update would be constructed on vacant and underutilized land in the City, and existing housing would not be displaced. Therefore, the Housing Element would have *less-than-significant* impacts related to the displacement of existing housing.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
<i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a. Residential development proposed by the Housing Element Update would be served by the Colfax Fire Department. The additional development of 45 housing units set forth by the Housing Element would increase the need for fire protection services in the City. However, the Housing Element Update contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development may require improvements to existing facilities or increases in staffing and equipment. Through the City's environmental review process, future development would be evaluated on an individual basis for potential impacts related to the provision of fire protection services. Without specific details regarding each development, the adequacy of fire protection is impossible to determine with any precision. These needs would be addressed and met as each development is constructed. Where needed, appropriate mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to a level that is *less-than-significant*.
- b. Residential Development proposed in the Housing Element Update would be served by the Placer County Sheriff Department. The additional development of 45 housing units set forth by the Housing Element would increase the need for police protection services in the City. However, the Housing Element Update contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development anticipated in the Housing Element Update may require improvements to existing facilities or increases in staffing and equipment. Through the City's environmental review process, future development would be evaluated on an individual basis for potential impacts related to the provision of police protection services. Without specific details regarding each development, the adequacy of police protection is impossible to determine with any precision. These needs would be addressed and met as each development is constructed. Where needed, appropriate mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to a level that is *less-than-significant*.

- c. Two school districts serve the Colfax Planning Area, the Colfax Elementary School District and the Placer Union High School District. All schools are located outside of the City boundaries (Colfax General Plan Initial Study, p. 13). The Housing Element Update identifies an assigned growth need of 45 additional housing units for development through 2008. Development of additional housing is provided to meet anticipated population growth, thereby increasing the demand on schools. Additional facilities and staffing may be necessary to accommodate the growth. Payment of the School Facilities Mitigation Fee has been deemed by the State legislature to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of a development project on the provision of adequate school facilities. The assessment of the standard School Facilities Mitigation Fee ensures that the Project would not result in a significant impact under CEQA, in accordance with Senate Bill 50, which became effective in 1998. Therefore, the impact from the proposed project would be *less-than-significant*.
- d. All local-serving park and recreation lands within the Planning Area are owned and operated by the Parks and Recreation Department, and local school district. The City of Colfax has adopted a standard, which requires a 3-5 acres per 1,000 residents (Colfax General Plan Natural Environment Element p. 6-10). The Housing Element Update identifies an assigned growth need of 45 additional housing units for development through 2008. The Housing Element Update contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development anticipated in the Housing Element Update would increase the demand for additional parkland in the City. All future residential development shall be reviewed to ensure consistency with the Colfax General Plan, all applicable City ordinances, and the community's open space and recreational needs. Adherence to these measures would reduce impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a,b. All local-serving park and recreation lands within the Planning Area are owned and operated by the City of Colfax parks and recreation department, and the local school district. The City of Colfax has adopted a standard, which requires 3-5 acres per 1,000 residents (Colfax General Plan National Environment Element p. 6-10). The Housing Element Update identifies an assigned growth need of 45 additional housing units for development through 2008. The Housing Element Update contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development anticipated in the Housing Element Update would increase the demand for additional parkland in the City. All future residential development shall be reviewed to ensure consistency with the Colfax General Plan, all applicable City ordinances, and the community's open space and recreational needs. Adherence to these measures would reduce impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	×	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a,b. The Housing Element Update identifies an assigned growth need of 45 additional housing units. Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Element does not include site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific transportation impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. All future residential development shall be reviewed to ensure consistency with all regional and local transportation plans and policies, the Colfax General Plan, and all applicable City ordinances. In addition, all proposals, both private and public, to develop new residential units shall be subject to a project-specific environmental analysis. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.

c. Development anticipated by the Housing Element Update involves the potential

development of 45 housing units on vacant and underutilized parcels of land throughout the City. The anticipated amount of development would not result in any changes to air traffic patterns nor would the anticipated amount of development result in any substantial safety risks related to aircraft traffic. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact*.

- d. The Housing Element Update identifies an assigned growth need of 45 additional housing units through 2008. Any needed traffic improvements associated with the anticipated development would be constructed to the City's roadway safety standards. The increased amount of traffic associated with the anticipated development would not substantially increase hazards to motorists, pedestrians or bicyclists. Through the City's environmental review process, future development projects would be evaluated for potential safety impacts. Where needed, appropriate mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.
- e. The Housing Element Update identifies an assigned growth need of 45 additional housing units through 2008. Any future residential projects would be required to conform to traffic and safety regulations that specify adequate emergency access measures. Without specific details regarding each development, the adequacy of emergency access is impossible to determine with any precision. Future development projects would be evaluated to determine adequacy of emergency access prior to its approval. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact to hazards resulting from design features.
- f. Development anticipated by the Housing Element Update involves the construction of residential dwelling units. Each development would be required to adhere to all applicable City of Colfax standards pertaining to the provision of parking facilities. Future development projects would be evaluated to determine adequacy of parking on an individual basis. Adherence to these standards would reduce potential parking impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.
- g. The City of Colfax contains access to several forms of alternative transportation such as buses, walking trails, and bike paths. The Housing Element Updated identifies an assigned growth need of 45 housing units by 2008. Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Element does not include site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific impacts to alternative transportation that may result with future housing development proposals. Future development proposals would provide for alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a,b,d,e. The City of Colfax Wastewater Treatment Plant was built in 1978. Currently, the Plant is functioning under a cease and desist order issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The plant has only marginal remaining capacity and has difficulty in meeting new, more stringent, discharge requirements. The City is required to upgrade the plant to provide additional plant capacity and improve treatment type by June 14, 2006. Currently, according to the Colfax Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Analysis report, the Wastewater Treatment Plant has sufficient capacity for a limited number of new equivalent dwelling units (EDUs). As a result, the City Council has adopted ordinance #478, which would allocate the remaining connections on a yearly basis until the plant

upgrades are completed in 2006. The ordinance provides an initial 11 EDU's for the period of October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004, of which 5 are specified for residential development. A two-member allocation subcommittee was also established to review the status of the plant and EDU absorption on a quarterly basis. The subcommittee will then allocate an average of 15 EDUs per year. Based on this review, the Subcommittee may recommend to the Council an adjustment in the available EDUs. Given the projected annual construction need of 10 units over the next three years, the current allocation of EDUs will be sufficient to meet the City's housing goals. Currently an Environmental Review is being conducted to assess potential impacts of the expansion of the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Water in the Colfax Planning Area is provided by the Placer County Water Agency. They have indicated that there is sufficient water availability to meet the needs of the Colfax Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

Construction anticipated by the Housing Element Update includes an assigned growth need of 45 housing units for development through 2008. Amending the City of Colfax General Plan to include the Housing Element Update would not result in any impacts to water and wastewater service because actions to implement the goals, policies, and programs included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan. However, the City would need to continue to carefully review individual projects and work with utility providers to ensure that future projects do not result in localized or project specific utility impacts and ensure that each project is contributing a fair share financial contribution to the ongoing improvement of the public systems. Water and wastewater improvements are required as part of a building permit for most types of "new development." Therefore, the Housing Element Update would have *less-than-significant* impacts to water and wastewater.

- c. Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific stormwater runoff impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case design review of future housing projects would be carried out to ensure the safety of the future communities, and that future projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. Adherence to such requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a *less-than-significant* level.
- f.g. Solid waste collection is a "demand-responsive" service and current service levels can be expanded and funded through user fees without difficulty. Future development would also coordinate with a certified waste hauler to develop curbside collection of recyclable materials within the City. All future development within the City shall comply with applicable elements of the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991. Future waste disposal needs cannot be accurately determined without site locations and specific project details. The volume of solid waste generated by the anticipated housing units set forth by the Housing Element Update is not anticipated to adversely impact landfills or other solid waste disposal facility. Where needed, appropriate

mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to a level that is *less-than-significant*.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a.b. Although the Housing Element Update identifies an assigned growth need of 45 additional housing units within the City, the Housing Element Update is a policy level document designed to guide the City in future planning through 2008. The number of units proposed for construction by the Housing Element can be accommodated within the Colfax City Limits and under the current General Plan designations. Future development proposals would be subject to the City's environmental review process and evaluated for potential cumulative impacts. Where needed, appropriate mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to a level that is *less-than-significant*.
- c.d. The General Plan buildout involves the implementation of the Housing Element Update for the City of Colfax. The Housing Element Update contains policies and programs rather than ordinance amendments or specific projects. However, the Housing

Element Update identifies an assigned growth need of 45 additional housing units within the City. This development would increase the amount of traffic on local roadways, emission of pollutants and particulate matter, generate noise within the project limits, impact the provision of public services, and may result in the loss of farm land and possibly affect the amount and distribution of biological resources. Without the exact number of units to be constructed or specifics details regarding each project, the effects on the environment, either directly or indirectly, is impossible to determine with any precision. Through the City's environmental review process, future development projects would be evaluated individually for potential direct and indirect impacts. Where needed, appropriate mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to a level that is less-than-significant. Therefore, the impact would be considered *less-than-significant*.